



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/605,042	09/03/2003	Steve Hotelling	APL1P285	2041
22434	7590	04/18/2006	EXAMINER	
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP P.O. BOX 70250 OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250			PERVAN, MICHAEL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2629	

DATE MAILED: 04/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/605,042	Applicant(s) HOTELLING ET AL.	
	Examiner Michael Pervan	Art Unit 2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 10-21 and 31-44 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 22-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5,22 and 26 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 1 and 22 objected to because of the following informalities: the first instance of "that" should instead be "than". Appropriate correction is required.
2. Claims 5 and 26 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claims 31 and 38. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-2, 4, 22-23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Scholder (US 5,805,144).

In regards to claim 1, Scholder discloses receiving first tracking information from a first tracking device 320 (Figure 3; col. 7, lines 16-22), periodically determining accuracy of the first tracking information (col. 8, lines 7-15, 28-35 and 39-43) and activating and using a second tracking device 220 (Figure 2) to acquire second tracking information (col. 6, lines 19-26) when said determining indicates that the accuracy of the first tracking information is inadequate, wherein the first tracking device is a

Art Unit: 2629

substantially lower power device than the second tracking device (col. 8, lines 7-15, 28-35 and 39-43).

In regards to claim 2, Scholder discloses deactivating the second tracking device when said determining indicates that the accuracy of the first tracking device is adequate (col. 8, lines 7-15, 28-35 and 39-43; since the driver can turn the enhanced mode on and activate the touchpad it can also turn the enhanced mode off and deactivate the touchpad).

In regards to claims 4 and 25, Scholder discloses pointing device including a surface sensor (col. 7, lines 16-18; it is inherent that a rolling ball detects surfaces since the ball is pushed up further into the pointing device when the device is placed upon a surface).

In regards to claim 22, Scholder discloses computer code for receiving first tracking information from a first tracking device (col. 7, lines 43-47), computer code for periodically determining accuracy of the first tracking information (col. 8, lines 28-35 and 39-43), computer code for activating and using a second tracking device to acquire second tracking information when said determining indicates that the accuracy of the first tracking information is inadequate (col. 8 lines 7-15, 28-35 and 39-43), wherein the first tracking device is substantially lower power than the second tracking device and computer readable medium 350 (Figure 3) for storing the computer code (col. 7, lines 42-47).

In regards to claim 23, Scholder discloses computer code for deactivating the second tracking device when said determining indicates that the accuracy of the first

Art Unit: 2629

tracking information is adequate (col. 8 lines 7-15, 28-35 and 39-43; since the driver can turn the enhanced mode on and activate the touchpad it can also turn the enhanced mode off and deactivate the touchpad).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 3 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scholder in view of Liu (US 6,351,257).

In regards to claims 3 and 24, Scholder discloses the first tracking device being an accelerometer 320 and 322 (Figure 3 and col. 7, lines 16-22; by moving the pointing device around the rolling ball is moved around and is able to detect the speed and direction of the pointing device therefore it acts as an accelerometer).

Scholder does not disclose the second tracking device being an optical tracking engine.

Liu discloses the second tracking device being an optical tracking engine 44 (Figure 3 and col. 2, lines 34-41; an image sensor detects optically therefore it is an optical tracking engine).

It would have been obvious at the time of invention to modify Scholder with the teachings of Liu because optical tracking engines are more accurate than a touch pad.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 10-21 and 31-44 allowed.

8. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Examiner was not able to find an adaptive duty cycle signal generator coupled to the optical engine and the inertial tracking engine arranged to compare tracking information provided by the inertial tracking device and provided by the optical tracing engine such that when the comparison is valid the adaptive duty cycle signal generator provides a first duty cycle signal that deactivates the optical tracking engine such that only the low power tracking engine provides the tracking information to the computer.

9. Claims 5-9, and 26-30 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Examiner was not able to find a surface sensor that deactivates both accelerometer and the optical tracking engine when it is determined that the surface is not a suitable surface, calibrating the accelerometer using a calibration value provided by the optical tracking engine.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed Jan. 26, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

11. In regards to claim 1, Applicant (on page 1 of argument) argued that Scholder's device at no point determines accuracy of either movement tracking mechanism (320)

Art Unit: 2629

or user position tracking mechanism (330), no discussion or suggestion of power utilization is of any concern and (on page 2 of argument) both movement tracking mechanism (320) and user position tracking mechanism (330) need to be active at the same time for the device to work properly. Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Scholder discloses a movement tracking mechanism (320) that uses a trackball (322) to determine position and a user position tracking mechanism (330) that uses a touchpad (220) to determine position. The accuracy of the touchpad is greater than that of the trackball, therefore when the user decides (determines) to use the touchpad, it has been decided that the accuracy of the trackball is not sufficient and the touchpad is used instead.

Scholder discloses a mouse cord (143) containing power. Regardless if the mouse is corded or cordless, that does not affect having a concern for power conservation. Power usage is still always a concern and will be minimized in either a corded or cordless mouse.

In claim 1, it does not cite that the activation of the second tracking device only takes place after the accuracy of the first tracking device is determined to be inadequate. Therefore, the first and second tracking device can both be activated even if the accuracy of the first tracking information is inadequate. Since, Scholder disclose movement tracking mechanism and user position tracking mechanism being used together this would read on claim 1.

Art Unit: 2629

In conclusion, Scholder may not read over the applicant's specification. However, the claim is broad enough that the examiner feels Scholder reads over said claim.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Pervan whose telephone number is (571) 272-0910. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday between 8am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amr Awad can be reached on (571) 272-7764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MVP
Apr. 10, 2006

AMR A. AWAD
PRIMARY EXAMINER

